

living on it; these are they who make things which the physicians are to use in carrying out the daily work of their profession. Isolated, alone, conspicuously open to unfair attack, we note a small, a pitifully small, group of men who courageously stand between these two bands—the unbusinesslike professional men and the shrewdly businesslike ones who live by and upon them. This little group of unprejudiced scientific men say, in effect, to the manufacturer who wishes physicians to use his product: "What is this which you wish physicians to use? You know that of the 125,000 physicians in this country, at least 100,000 are too busy or too credulous to look into the truth of what you say about your product. We stand here for them and we wish to investigate your article and your statements so that you may not impose upon them; all that we ask is that you shall tell us, and through us the medical profession of the United States, the exact truth, that so lives may not be placed in jeopardy." All of which seems the acme of simplicity and one would imagine that, reasoning *a priori*, every one of the 125,000 physicians would cry out for joy and every one of the 250 medical journals would give hearty and sincere editorial endorsement of a policy that would so greatly help those in whose interests their publications are supposedly issued. But what are the facts? Alas! Of the 250 journals all but possibly 25 have attacked this effort to eliminate dishonesty and fiction, either positively and openly or negatively and secretly. Why? Can it possibly be that those who control these medical journals are blind to the truth of the exposures of frauds that have been revealed? Can it possibly be that they hold the prejudiced statement of the interested party of more value than the unbiased statement of a group of trained scientific men who have no ulterior object to accomplish? It would be absurd to credit them with such stupidity. There seems to be one only influence of sufficient weight and power to make men cast aside what they must know in their hearts is the truth and abide with what they must know is false and dishonorable—the almighty dollar. That which man will not do for wealth, has yet to be discovered. How long medical men will continue actively to perpetrate fraud on their fellows after their sin has found them out, no man can say; that they are now doing it, a dispassionate observation by any one will show. Truly, the present condition of the medical profession of the United States is anomalous in the extreme. And some organizations of medical men are no less anxious to be influenced toward the wrong than are single units, when it comes to taking the unsound and dishonestly earned dollars of the unscrupulous manufacturer. That is the pity of it.

When a real nice lady-like old party slaps you on the bare wrist and says, "There, now! You be good!"—aint it awful? When you're doing something you feel sure is right; when you're making a fight that you know is right; when you see the opposition to such a fight and know just exactly what

inspires it and how rotten with debased and debasing commercialism the inspiration of the opposition is, is it not too bad to be chidden? It is, indeed it is. The management of your JOURNAL is in tears; it is going about in sack cloth and ashes; its wails may be heard resounding through the night and disturbing even the cat; for your JOURNAL has been scolded—slapped on the bare wrist! We had the temerity to say that those firms whose preparations we use should advertise in our JOURNAL and thus help along the fight for decency by aiding in its support. We went further and said that other things being equal we should use the goods manufactured by those who do advertise with us in preference to those of firms who do not aid us. That seemed a perfectly fair proposition and we have asked—and received—the support of a large number of our members on that as a platform. Furthermore, we have asked our members always to demand of the detail man, when he first enters the office, an answer to the question, "Does your house advertise in our JOURNAL? and if not, why?" Secondly, "Is your stuff approved by the Council? and if not, why?" These are simple things, but we think they are just and right. The *Medical World*, of Philadelphia, however, thinks this is perfectly dreadful! We should be ashamed! We are quite naughty! We are to be chid! We have been slapped on the wrist! "Aint it rotten Rosie?"

That pestiferous publication, *N. A. R. D. Notes*, a small sheet representing the purely commercial side of pharmacy and one which some time ago urged druggists to "push" peruna and any other old patent medicine that offered a certain possible profit, has recently come out with another startling suggestion. From the issue of September 17th we quote the following:

"There is no necessity for the doctor to dispense except in cases of emergency, and when he quits it his druggist should be punished if he doesn't quit counter prescribing," says an anonymous writer, and he is right, as far as he goes. But two wrongs never make a right. Is a druggist justified in counter prescribing because the doctor dispenses? There are decidedly two ways of looking at this question."

Was there ever a more pernicious suggestion! To encourage pharmacists in the illegal practice of medicine! And this from a publication representing the National Association of Retail Druggists. Can it be that that represents the attitude of any considerable number of pharmacists? We most sincerely trust that it does not. The duty of the physician is plain. It is his to relieve, if possible, the patient who calls upon him for professional assistance. Whether this relief shall come from an operation, from suggestion, from advice, from regulation of habit and diet, from baths, from drugs administered by the physician at the time, or given to the patient by the physician or prepared for the patient by the druggist upon the written order of the physician, are all immaterial questions; the one